

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6468

LUTHER DANIEL STIDHAM,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

SUPERINTENDENT LAMAR PAYSOUR; DIRECTOR ROBERT C. LEWIS,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan,
Chief District Judge. (5:10-hc-02029-FL)

Submitted: August 24, 2011

Decided: August 30, 2011

Before WILKINSON, GREGORY, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Luther Daniel Stidham, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge,
III, Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Luther Daniel Stidham seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Stidham has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We further deny Stidham's pending motions, including his motions to amend exhibits, for an expedited ruling, for release pending appeal, and for acquittal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED